4th May 1962]

DR. A. SREENIVASAN : He was there. But, Sir, now he is no longer in the service of the temple. That is what I want to bring to the notice of the Government, and I want to know whether it is a lady who is now performing the functions of the priest in the temple. The other priest has been practically liquidated.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : If the hon. Member will pass on the information to me in writing, I shall have the matter looked into.

SRI K. ANBAZHAGAN : தலைவர் அவர்களே, அர்ச்சகர்களாகப் பெண்கள் இருக்கக்கூடாது என்று தடையேதும் இருக்கிறதா? அல்லது ஆண்களுக்கு உள்ள உரிமை பெண்களுக்கு மறுக்கப் படுகிறதா?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : அதைப்பற்றி எனக்குத் தெரியாது. இப்போது அரசியல் அமைப்புச் சட்டம், ஆகம சாஸ்திரம் இவ்விரண்டுக்கும் வித்தியாசம் பாராட்டப்படுகிறதா என்று எனக்குத் தெரியாது.

* 38 *Q.*—DR. A. SREENIVASAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of trustees for the Theerthavaleeswarar temple at Krishnampet, Madras;

(*b*) the assets of the temple movable and immovable;

(*c*) whether the accounts of the temple have been audited periodically; and

(*d*) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (*a*) Two Trustees, Sir.

(*b*) Moveable properties of the temple :

Jewels and valuables—Gold Pottus, etc., worth about—Rs. 15.

Brass and Sundry articles—Articles worth about—Rs. 110.

Utsava Idols—There are 20 items worth about—Rs. 635.

Other Paraphernalia worth about—Rs. 125.

Immovable properties of the temple :

No. 5, Irusappa Gramani Street (one house).

No. 142, Dr. Natesan Street (one house).

Katta Thotti (Firewood shop).

Vacant site in front of the temple on the right side.

Vacant site on the back side of the temple (24½ feet * 76 feet) and the land occupied by huts.

(*c*) Yes, Sir.

(*d*) Does not arise.

[14th May 1962

Dr. A. SREENIVASAN : Sir, is it a fact that the trustees themselves are making use of the houses and they are in great arrears in the payment of rent for the houses to the temple?

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I have no such information with me, Sir. If the hon. Member would pass on the information to me, I can tell him, I shall have the matter looked into.

Sri G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Is there any proposal to electrify the temple and make it more attractive and celebrate festivals?

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I have no information, Sir.

Secondary grade teachers

* 39 Q.—Sri G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state whether, and if so, when, the scale of pay of Rs. 45—2—85 for secondary grade teachers has been brought into force in panchayat elementary schools in Thanjavur district?

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Yes, Sir, from 1st November 1956, except in respect of nine Panchayat Elementary Schools in the District.

Sri G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Sir, has payment been denied in respect of teachers in these nine panchayat elementary schools?

8-10 p.m. The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The panchayat could not pay according to the enhanced scale, because their financial position did not permit it.

Sri G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Since the ultimate responsibility, according to the latest procedure, is that of the Government, cannot the Government examine this question of payment to these teachers retrospectively?

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : It was only from 1st November 1956 that a uniform scale of pay of Rs. 45—2—85 was fixed for secondary grade teachers under all kinds of management. It was then provided that the extra expenditure should be borne by the panchayats themselves. Now the panchayats have been taken over by the Panchayat Union Councils, and the position will not remain the same. The matter has to be looked into further.

Sri G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : My point, Sir, is this. As it is not the fault of the teachers, cannot the Government examine the matter afresh and see that they are paid retrospectively now that they have taken over the responsibility?

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : In 1956, when the Government issued this order, it was provided that the extra expenditure should be met by the panchayats themselves. That was the order of the Government then. Therefore, there was no question of giving retrospective effect.